

App. Ser. No. 10/764,509

Amendment dated Apr. 23, 2007

Reply to Office action of Dec. 21, 2006

Docket No. AB-1634-1D US

(Ref. No. LW6001US/HJ)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above amendment and the following remarks are in reply to the non-final Office action of 12/21/06. In light of this reply, reconsideration and further examination of this application are respectfully requested.

Nineteen claims (18-36) were pending in this application. In reply to a previous Restriction/Election requirement, 2 claims (24 and 32) were provisionally withdrawn from consideration. In the above amendment, 12 claims (18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 31 and 33-36) were amended, two claims (24 and 32) were cancelled, and four new claims (37-40) were added. Accordingly, 21 claims (18-23, 25-31 and 33-40) are now pending for reconsideration and further examination.

In section 4 of the Office action, the Examiner noted as follows,

[I]ndependent claim 18 can't be read in Species I because the display device (i.e., the monitor unit 110) does not comprise the claimed second PCB since the control board 150 is disposed in the main body 100, but not in the display device (110) (see Fig.3). Further, since independent claim 18 can't be read in Species I, all claims depending upon claim 18 must not recite feature, which is only disclosed in Species I, e.g., claim 24 recites a feature, 'the second connecting member is a flexible printed circuit (FPC),' which is only read in Species I.

It is [also noted] that *the specification and drawings do not disclose a display device comprising more than one first PCB (source PCB) of claim 32.* The specification and drawings only teaches the display device comprising more than one first connecting member (i.e., data transmission films 363/535/83 1, see Figs. 2, 8 and 13).

Accordingly, upon the allowance of independent claim 18, claims 24 and 32 will not be considerably allowable for the reasons indicated above. Examiner suggests the Applicants to cancel these claims." (Emphasis added.)

Responsive to the foregoing, claims 24 and 32 have been cancelled herein.

In section 6 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 18-23 and 25-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baek et al. (US 6,977,640 B1, hereinafter Baek), and further in view of Takahashi et al. (US 5,889,572).

In section 7, claims 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baek above in view of Takahashi as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Furuhashi et al. (US 5,909,205), hereinafter Furuhashi.

In light of the above claim amendments and the remarks that follow, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections are now moot.

In particular, independent claim 18 now includes the following distinguishing limitations:

“a first printed circuit board (PCB) comprising a source PCB closely attached to a rear plane of the display panel and electrically coupled to the display panel through the first connecting member, the first connecting member being attached to a first portion of the first PCB; and,

a second PCB comprising a driving circuit PCB closely attached to the rear plane of the display panel and having a first portion electrically connected to the first PCB without using a separate connecting member.”

It is respectfully submitted that none of Baek, Takahashi, or Furuhashi, whether taken individually or in any combination desired, teach or even suggest the foregoing distinguishing limitations, and accordingly, that claim 18, as well as the claims respectively dependent from it, are patentable over all of the foregoing references.

Additionally, new independent claim 37 includes the limitations of original claims 18, 33 and 34. On page 5, lines 16-17 of the Office action, the Examiner states, “As to claim 34, Fig. 6 of the Baek reference expressly shows the signal converting unit (42) closely attached to a rear plane of the receiving container (the panel housing 22A).” However, reference numeral 42 of Baek indicates a scanning receiver, and the scanning receiver 42 of Baek cannot be equated to the signal converting unit of the present invention. Additionally, the scanning receiver 42 is not closely attached to a rear plane of the panel housing 22A (refer to FIG. 6). Therefore, Baek does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention, “a signal converting unit electrically connected to the second PCB to convert an externally provided analog video signal into a digital video signal and to provide the converted signal to the second PCB, ... the signal converting unit being closely attached to a rear plane of the receiving container,” as claimed in new independent claim 37.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 37-40 are also patentable over the art of record.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all 21 pending claims (18-23, 25-31 and 33-40) are now allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any questions regarding this reply, the undersigned can be reached at the number below.

App. Ser. No. 10/764,509


Amendment dated Apr. 23, 2007

Reply to Office action of Dec. 21, 2006

Docket No. AB-1634-1D US

(Ref. No. LW6001US/HJ)

The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees required and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2257.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
	<u>Apr. 23, 2007</u>
Sandra L. Carr	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Don C. Lawrence

Applicant's attorney

Reg. No. 31,975

Tel: (949) 752-7040